

do not see how we can even expect not to see these kinds of impacts on the children who lost their parents in that terrible tragedy.

□ 2215

I hope that all of them will be made whole, and that they will again see joy in America and joy in their lives. I know there are loving relatives who will be reaching out to take care of them, many of them. But in instances where they will need foster care or adoption assistance or psychological care or different kinds of educational care, can this Congress not step up to the plate?

The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry likewise is offering their support: "On behalf of the Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, I offer our full support for H. Con. Res. 228. The resolution recognizes that the delivery of crucial services and benefits is sometimes delayed."

Again, we emphasize that all Members of Congress should support this legislation. I thank Clarice J. Kestenbaum, M.D., president of this organization, for supporting this legislation.

This is crucial. Why we are delaying in the passage of this I cannot understand. I am gratified for the interest of the Senate, the other body, in its review of this legislation, and I do believe that we will have the opportunity to see this legislation passed.

I would hope that we will spend the next couple of days and weeks debating issues that will help the people who lost their loved ones; that we will spend time trying to help those who have been impacted even beyond the terrible violence of September 11, 2001.

I would like to add to my concerns the fact that this House has not brought forth legislation that I have cosponsored, and many others, the Gephardt legislation on the help and assistance for laid-off workers. The headline in USA Today: "Tough Times for Laid-Off Low-Income Workers."

"After attacks, the jobless rate climbs and assistance is harder to come by for America's working poor." This is a long article that indicates that Congress has yet not finished its job.

That is what I would say about what we owe families like the Calderons, who lost Lizzie Martinez Calderon, their mother. And there their dad is taking care of these two wonderful and beautiful children, children who I know will be loved so much by him and his family, though he indicated that he is here without many of his relatives. They need our help.

H. Con. Res. 228 is a legislative initiative that needs to be passed, and these laid-off workers need our help, as well. Can this Congress only talk about nuts and bolts and not talk about the human loss, the sense and the depth of the feeling that these families are hav-

ing, having to take care of these precious children without any assistance?

Can we not encourage task forces where necessary, in areas where this impact is felt, that they begin to organize around assisting and providing for these children, making sure that the red tape, administrative red tape, the statutory red tape is not inhibiting or prohibiting the care and nurturing of these precious babies?

House Concurrent Resolution 228 is a simple proposition. It is a sense of Congress. It is a statement to the American people. It is a statement to those States where there is an impact from the tragedy of September 11, where there were so many dads possibly lost in one city, where 4,000 orphans were possibly created at the Twin Towers, where there are guesstimates of between 10,000 and 15,000 children who have lost a parent, guardian, or parents.

And yet on the floor of the House since September 11 we have not dedicated one moment to talk about our children and to pass legislation for these children, to encourage our Federal agencies, from the Department of Education to Health and Human Services to many, many others, to be able to talk about these children.

Health and Human Services has a whole department dealing with mental health issues. I believe they should be front and center in determining how we can help these children.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, let me simply say that I believe it is the obligation of this House to take some time to care about our babies and about our children. These children who have lost their parents, these children need our help, and we need to move H. Con. Res. 228 in order to help our children.

ON THE PASSING OF THE HON. JERRY SOLOMON, CHARLIE DANIELS, THE AIRLINE BAILOUT BILL, PROFILING, AMERICA'S BORDERS, AND BEING POLITICALLY CORRECT

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I will start out by saying I take issue with the comment the gentlewoman made that it is about time this House paid attention to some of the needs of the people out here. What does the gentlewoman think the House is doing? Everybody in the House, Republican or Democrat, cares about the horrible losses that occurred in New York City, that occurred in the Pentagon, the economic losses across the country.

I think it is wrong for any of my colleagues to stand up here and imply that one side or the other is not taking the time to care about the people of

this Nation. I believe every Republican and every Democratic Congressman, and I do not agree with all of them, but I can tell the Members that all in one way or another are committed to moving this country forward in some type of positive fashion.

Since the tragedy of September 11, I have not come across any Congressman that does not care about the children or the people who have been hurt by the consequences of that horrible, horrible tragedy. So I think it is important, and I think it is a responsibility of every one of my colleagues when they stand up here and speak and we address each other, that we acknowledge at the very beginning that Republicans and Democrats care about the needs of these people; and that while we may have debates, the fact that we have a debate should not signify that for some reason that means that people do not care about the people who have been hurt or impacted out there in any kind of negative fashion.

So I do take exception with that comment, and I hope the clarification later resonates from some of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention, with due respect to my good colleague, Jerry Solomon, who passed away over the weekend, Jerry was a remarkable man. He was a Congressman from the State of New York, chairman of the Committee on Rules, and served 20 years in the United States Congress.

He had a lot of guts. He spoke very eloquently on the floor. He represented his interests, the interests of the State of New York, the interests of the things that he believed in so strongly, veterans affairs and business issues that he was very well-versed in. He used to be an insurance agent.

His unexpected loss last week is a loss to this Nation. I want to send my deepest regards to his family. I hear his service is going to be tomorrow. I intend to attend that service, and will represent my colleagues who cannot attend that. So our warm wishes and warm regards to the family of a very remarkable man who we all had the privilege of serving with in the House of Representatives.

Also tonight on Hannity and Colmes, the TV show on Fox Network, I saw Charlie Daniels, the country western singer. I can tell the Members, he was talking about this newest song where he talks about the flag, and the pride in the flag.

Charlie Daniels represents, in my opinion, a lot of people in this country. There are a lot of blue-collar workers out there. He is their hero. He is their singer.

I just wanted to say I hope Members get an opportunity, if they ever see him, tell him to stick to his guns, by gosh, because he is right. What happens is there is so much of this politically correct garbage going on out there: Oh,

my gosh, look at this song, it is not politically correct because it may offend some group out there.

We need to move a little further away from political correctness and get back to realism. Charlie Daniels represents the views of a lot of people in this country. And how interesting, people who jump up and yell about his song, and they object to his song because at some point, through some type of interpretation, it might offend somebody, and therefore Charlie Daniels' song should not be allowed at some concert, those are the very same people that demand freedom of speech when they come up with a controversial issue.

I just wanted to pass on to my colleagues, if they get a chance to listen to Charlie Daniels in an interview, he obviously holds his own. I want to send a commendation to that song. I think it is a great song, and I think it represents a lot of the views across this country.

Tonight, for the main context of my remarks, there are a number of different things I want to talk about. First of all, I want to talk about the airline bailout bill. I am going to go into some of the promises and some of the thoughts that those of us who supported that bail-out bill have.

I am not the kind of person, Members can tell from my record, who is inclined for a government bail-out of any type of industry, but I felt some convictions about this, the need for the airline industry to stay afloat. Frankly, I felt some sense of betrayal this week by United Airlines, which has a large location in Denver, Colorado.

I want to visit a little about profiling, the need for profiling, who uses profiling in our society, and why I think profiling is an essential ingredient for law enforcement. Profiling is dictated by common sense, and every one of us in these chambers uses profiling every day in our life.

Why all of a sudden, when we talk about using profiling to protect the security of this Nation, to provide homeland security for this Nation, to hopefully prevent another terrorist act, why all of a sudden should profiling then become politically incorrect? It makes no sense. I want to go into that in a little more detail.

I want to talk about our borders. Clearly we have a problem on our borders. We have 500 million crossings, 500 million crossings every year on our borders. Maybe we ought to consider a dramatic tightening of those borders until we can get control of those borders.

Some people said it is impossible to track those kinds of numbers. If we have a huge amount of numbers crossing the border and it overwhelms the operation of tracking, the only obvious thing, if we cannot upgrade that operation quickly, and obviously we cannot

do that, we need to downgrade the amount of volume coming in. It is a pretty easy decision to make. I want to go into more depth on that.

I want to talk a little more, again, coming back to this politically correct thing and the challenges that we face in this war that we are engaged in.

We cannot fight a war being politically correct. We cannot be a nice guy in a war. In a war, the nice guy always loses. The nice guy never wins in a war. We have to be in the war, we have to be in there tough, we have to be tenacious, we have to strike horribly against our enemy. We have to hit our enemy so hard they swear they would never want to see us again, never want to ever cross our path again.

When we tiptoe through the tulips, we are not made to go to war. This country has a war, here. This is not some far-off imagination of ours, this is a war that struck us in our homeland. We have to strike a horrible blow to those, I feel like calling them a horrible name, to those cancers, and I professionalize myself here on the floor and will not violate the rule. That is not what my gut says to call those people who brought across the ocean this horrible act against our country.

The fact is, they started this war. They are the ones responsible for casualties and consequential or collateral damages that occur here. We do not owe anybody any apologies. The United States of America did not start this war. The United States of America did not dare somebody to come and destroy the World Trade Center Towers, or strike the Pentagon.

The United States of America was the victim in this war, and now all of a sudden even U.S. citizens, I begin to sense some are becoming apologetic, politically correct, saying we have the Ramadan coming on, do not bomb during their holy holiday.

Do Members think those people would not have set off a nuclear weapon in this country on Christmas day? If we think that, we are crazy. These people will do whatever is necessary. Remember, most of the Muslims, by far, the largest number of Muslims killed so far in this engagement were killed by the terrorists who struck the World Trade Towers and killed 400 or 800, I forget the exact number, but it is in that range, of Muslims and people that practice the Islam faith.

That is where those casualties came from: They killed their own people. These people, these terrorists and bin Laden preached that they are standing up for Islam, and as part apparently of their interpretation of Islam they can go at will, at their choosing, at their timing, and kill other people of the faith. That is exactly what they did in New York City. That is exactly what they did at the Pentagon.

Now people are saying we should handle these people politically correctly?

We should tiptoe through the tulips for these people? I will get into that in more detail, too. I anticipate having a full evening in this discussion with these topics. Let us go back and let us start with the airline bailout bill.

The airline bailout bill was about \$15 billion. We face a situation which the airlines in this country have never faced in their history. No airline in the history of airline aviation has suffered two crashes, two crashes caused by an act of terrorism that hit a domestic target; two targets, two airplanes, two sets of terrorists, and a domestic target and thousands and thousands of casualties. United Airlines and American Airlines both suffered that fate on the same day, September 11.

□ 2230

We all know the facts. We know what happened there. It brought the airline industry to their knees, but it almost brought them right on the verge of collapse. The United States Government for the protection of its citizens ordered that all airlines cease business for several days. And the consequences of that terrorist attack are obvious to all of us.

Today I flew in on a plane in Denver, Colorado. It was United Airlines plane, a 737. My guess is it had the capacity to hold 120 passengers, I guess. We had 10 or 12 passengers outside of the crew on that airplane.

The consequences of that act of September 11 are devastating to the airline industry. Now it has been devastating to a lot of us and to a lot of economic factors in our society. But this society of ours, this Nation of ours, the security of this Nation, the business of this Nation, the ability to move around in this Nation is very, very dependent on an efficient airliner service. So it is to the best interest of all of us that we keep the airlines, at least kept them from the verge of collapse.

Sure we ought to let the Adam Smith philosophy of the market take place. I am a big fan of Adam Smith. I think he is right. But there are appropriate times for the government to step in. I believed when United Airlines talked and when the other airlines talked to us, I believed, even though some of my colleagues debated on the other side of the issue, I believed that this money would be well spent and that the airlines would exercise their responsibility in the utilization of this kind of money, and that the airlines would realize that they have a debt, not just to the stockholders as a corporation, but that they also have some responsibility to this Nation, that they too have to pitch in and be good neighbors. And a lot of those airlines did it, Jet Blue, American, some of these others, they have come, and they have risen to that responsibility.

What happened over at United Airlines? United Airlines has a chief executive officer which I think has run that

airline into the ground. His name is Goodwin.

Well, Goodwin has been with United Airlines for 34 years. That is a lot of years of service. He has successfully done more to bring an airline to the verge of collapse than any airline executive I have known for a number of years. So over the weekend United Airlines decided because the capability of Mr. Goodwin to run United Airlines has been severely diminished by his own shortcomings, they decided they needed to pay the guy to leave. I want to give you an idea.

Some of the people who opposed the airline bailout bill said this money is just going to fatten the pockets of the chief executive officers. I felt, come on, give the airlines a break. Frankly, several of airlines, including United Airlines, froze the salaries of their executives. And I think that is good will that has been put forth by some of these airlines. But while they froze the pay of some of these executives, look at what United Airlines just did today.

By the way, I wanted to compare it. This morning I talked with a United employee in Denver, Colorado who had been with the company for 30-some years. Let us just call it 30 years. This particular employee was at the desk. I guess it is a ticket agent, an agent at the desk for United Airlines. This particular person was a 30-year employee over here to my left on this poster. Her retirement after spending 30 years with the airline is \$2,000 per month which is approximately \$65 a day. For the rest of her life she will receive approximately \$65 a day. That is her retirement after serving for United with 30-plus years.

Now, she did not run that airline into the ground. She did not help contribute to the near demise of United Airlines. Her service has been recognized throughout by the company itself. Now ironically, her retirement falls within two days of Mr. Goodwin's termination. Her time, her service with the company of 30-some years falls very close to the same time and service with the company that Mr. Goodwin's does.

Now let us take a look at what United Airlines, after receiving assistance from the Federal Government to help bail them out, take a look at what that airline has just done to terminate their executive that has put their company on the verge of bankruptcy. I call it the United Airlines Bailout and then I move it over to Blowout after I saw this morning what the United Airlines has done for their executive.

They added 6 years of service to his retirement. Now, this employee over here spent 30-some years, 30 years and some months with United. When this individual was given a choice, frankly, 72 hours they wanted people over a certain time to retire, they did not offer to this individual to say, hey, we will move you from 30 years to 36 years. But

they did it with their chief executive office. They went to Goodwin. Again, I want to stress how strongly I feel that Mr. Goodwin is where the buck stops. That is the individual who has brought this company to the verge of bankruptcy.

What do they do? They have given him 6 years added service. Although he did not work the 6 years, they will add it to his 34 years of service so his retirement treats him as if he had 40 years with United Airlines.

Now, what does that mean? That means that his pension will be \$500,000 a year. That is his requirement; \$500,000 a year for the rest of his life. What does that figure out to be?

Well, remember, my ticket agent over here that gets \$65 a day for the rest of her life and this chief executive officer who almost runs the company into the ground will be making \$1,400 a day. United Airlines agreed to pay him \$1,400 a day every day for the rest of his life and his work is done with United. He walked out the door. That is not all.

Take a look: 611,450 stock options have been granted to this chief executive officer. This is a company that my colleagues here, that the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, the President of the United States has sent \$15 billion to the airline industry and asked them to exercise responsibility in keeping their airlines above water and here is what they do: 611,450 stock options.

Now today those stock options are under water which means they have no value. But these stock options are for 10 years. So if there is any bet at all, if United recovers at all, imagine that every dollar of recovery that United has, his profit goes up \$611,000. Every dollar that that United stock moves up from this point through the next 10 years, if it moves at all, he will make in proportion \$611,000 for every dollar rise in that stock.

Now on top of it, it is not enough that United agreed to pay him \$1,400 for every day for the rest of his life, United felt apparently that Mr. Goodwin who almost took their company into bankruptcy, Mr. Goodwin was not being treated well enough, so they decided to get him severance pay. What is that severance pay? Well, we cannot get an exact number. We think just to get him to walk out the door, they gave him \$5 to \$7 million. Here is your check for \$5 to \$7 million, Mr. Goodwin. Thanks for almost destroying the country. By the way, here is your \$65 check, ma'am, for being a ticket agent at one of our counters for 30 years with United Airlines.

But it does not stop there for Mr. Goodwin. They continue to go on. Forty thousand more shares given to him on termination. So they give him \$5 million in severance. They say they will pay him \$1,400 a day every day for the rest of his life, and then on top of

it because maybe his feelings have been hurt, the board throws in another 40,000 shares at today's values, another \$700,000. That is not all. They decide just to make sure that Mr. Goodwin's future is well cared for, he get his membership at the country club.

Tell me when is the last time they ever bought a dinner at the country club for one of these employees, for one of the United Airline employees that was not in Mr. Goodwin's office. So they agree to keep his membership in the country club. They agree to provide him with a company car. They agree to continue to provide his life insurance.

Give me a break United Airlines. Where do you think your credibility is when some of us stand up and we are willing to take the heat that contrary to our philosophy and our support of Adam Smith, we decide to go out on a limb on your behalf and every other airliners behalf to try to save the airline industry as a result of the tragedy on September 11? This is what we are beginning to find out. This is where some of this money is going.

Where is your credibility, United?

I was really disgusted, and that is a strong word, but that is how I felt this morning. It just was ironic that I happened to run into that ticket agent whose last day is tomorrow after 30 years and to see she is going to be paid \$65 a day for doing a good job for United Airlines, and then United Airlines turns around to the individual who has almost turned that company, and I would not be surprised if that company does go into bankruptcy, but to that individual who has almost driven that company into bankruptcy, they will pay him \$1,400 a day, \$5 million check on the way out, maybe a \$7 million check on the way out, \$700,000 for stock shares they just gave him that day. Go ahead. We will keep you in the country club. And, by the way, that car you are driving over there, we will pay for the car, the gas, et cetera, et cetera.

No wonder people feel there is some sort of class division in the country. No wonder people feel there is a little injustice. No wonder Congressmen like myself end up biting their tongue and having second thoughts about this airline bailout, and whether or not this money is really going where it needs to go, and that is to keep a healthy airline industry from collapsing through the floor as a result of acts of the terrorism against this country.

Let me move on from my dismay with the way that United Airlines has handled this situation and talk about profiling.

I think profiling is a pretty interesting subject. Recently I have heard politically correct shows and some of my colleagues here on the floor, do not dare reach out and profile people at the border. Do not profile people on the

street. Profiling should have no place in law enforcement.

Yes, it is pretty ironic to hear that kind of argument. Profiling is used at every stage of our life. Everywhere you go. Everyone on this floor uses profiling. We use profiling in our own campaigns. We go out to our district and we have experts that come in, we have polsters that come in and they say, all right, in this age group, 18 to 23, we know this percentage of these people are going to register and, of the registered, these percentage of people are going to vote; and that percentage routinely is pretty low in your district. But over here that age group, 45 to 50, and they may be white male, they may be Hispanic, Irish, whatever it is, they tend to go along more with your issues. They have a much higher voter turnout. So we want you to target this age group. Do not go after the age 18 to 21 because there is not a high enough percentage.

They will tell you, go after the white male or the single parent or the head of household or the person that brings the income in, the income earner. They are very targeted. They profile in our own campaigns; and every one of my colleagues has been the beneficiary of this kind of profiling.

We use profiling with insurance. We know, for example, that if you have a young man who is between the ages of say 16 and 23 that that individual is more likely to drink and drive, more likely to drive a car at a high speed and much more likely to run a stop sign than somebody that is 45 to 50 years old. And as a result of that kind of profiling, we can determine where our higher risks are and we can adjust for that in regards to the insurance premiums that we charge.

So we use it in our campaigns. We use it to determine insurance. We use it to determine risks. We use it in schools, our testing mechanisms. We test and we profile. We profile in our school neighborhoods. We profile to see which particular segment of population, whether it is a white at certain poverty level, whether it is black, whether it is mixture, whether it is geographic location, et cetera, et cetera, we put a bunch of factors in there so we can determine which kind of education will get the best results and be the most benefit to that particular profile group.

So we use profiling for campaigns, we use profiling for insurance, we use profiling in our educational institutions.

Do not let the newspapers who run these editorials, some of the liberal newspapers in this Nation, who run editorials about profiling and how bad profiling is. Man, talk about hypocritical.

□ 2245

Take a look at that newspaper and see what kind of profiling they do,

what kinds of marketing they do to figure out where their advertisers are, where their market is, who is going to buy their newspapers, who reads the sports page. Any newspaper in this country will tell you very accurately what percentage of their readers read their editorials, what percentage of their readers read the sports section, which is the most read page in the newspaper, what age segment reads the sports section. They probably do not have a lot of people 70 and above that read the sports section. They may read the social page. But they know between about 12 and, say 35 that that is their main focus in a newspaper.

Newspapers profile. They have very dramatic profiles. It is smart business. Of course they do it. No matter where we look in our society we see profiling. Even sports teams, they profile. They know who goes to their games, they know who buys their tickets and who to appeal to. They know where to place their advertising. Even in recruiting their athletes, they know which areas are more likely to produce a better athlete than other areas. They use this profiling extensively.

So, for God's sake, why do we not use profiling to protect the national security of this Nation? Why are some people out there saying the politically correct thing to do is, well, all in all we better not profile at our borders, we better not stop somebody who is suspicious just based on the fact that they, let's say for example they are Arab, come from the Islam faith and come from a particular age bracket. Listen, we know those statistics. We can develop risk statistics from profiling.

Now, obviously, I do not support, and I do not know any of my colleagues on this floor, not one Democrat or one Republican, that supports profiling based solely on race. That is discrimination. Nobody questions that. We ought to have zero tolerance for that. In other words, we should not just go and say, hey, that individual is Irish or that individual is black so they must be a suspect. We only take that so far. I mean if we have a bank robbery and the description, the profile, of the bank robber is a white male between 19 and 24, why would we be in the black neighborhood interviewing black people to see if they were the bank robber? Clearly, at some point, we begin to profile. But that is one of the factors.

I do not want my colleagues or anyone to be drawn into signing a statement or acknowledging that, look, profiling has no place in a war against people that want to tear our guts out, against people that killed thousands and thousands of people at the New York World Trade Center, or over here at the Pentagon where they killed hundreds of people. We ought to use every weapon we have against these people. We ought to be prepared to use what-

ever method, whatever weapon, whatever energies we have to win this battle. We cannot afford to be the nice guy here. Oh sure, war has kind of a parameter of what should be done, but the fact is that in that spectrum there is a lot of horrible things that happen in a war.

I wish we could avoid this war. I do not know anyone out there that wants to be engaged in the war we are in. I do not know anyone that chose to have us get into the predicament that we are in today. Maybe there are some out there, I hope not, but I do not know many people out there that think we had this coming. This is a war that was brought upon us. The United States did not strike out against anyone. Thank goodness we are too great a Nation to do that. We do not do those kinds of acts of terrorism. But when somebody strikes at the United States, the kind of blow they dealt us on September 11, and we have felt every hour and every minute and every day since September 11, we need to strike back with a horrible, horrible swift sword.

Now, there are a lot of people out there that are counting on the fact that the United States of America might be too timid to strike back and that the United States of America just does not have the resolve to strike hard, that there is going to be a little pretend bombing over here, hit a soft target there, and a soft target there and declare a victory. Well, thank goodness we have an administration that in my opinion is not going to go by that playbook. This administration, in my opinion, George W. Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Condoleezza Rice, these people, they understand we are engaged in a war.

We cannot stop a war for the holidays. The Taliban would not stop for us. The Taliban wants one thing: They want every man, woman and child in the United States of America destroyed. They do not want to save the children of the United States. They do not want to avoid the loss of children. They do not want to save Muslims in the United States of America. They do not want to save the people of the Islam faith in the United States of America. They want to destroy them simply because of the fact that they are in the United States of America. You can take that to the bank.

Take a look at what happened at the World Trade Center. There were many people of the Islam faith that were destroyed and their families destroyed through the consequences of these actions. We had many Muslims that may not even have been of the Islamic faith that were destroyed, that were killed. They were slaughtered in New York City. So do not give this Taliban or ben Laden any kind of badge of courage. Do not give him any kind of credibility because you think they fight with honor. They do not fight with honor. They

fight with cheap shots. They would just as soon gut you in the back as to fight you face-to-face.

That is the kind of war we are engaged in with these people. This is a tough situation that we have. We have to use the weapons and the tools that are available to us. There is a vast array of those, but the one I am focusing on here is profiling. Again, let me reiterate that profiling based solely, and the only reason to do it is to discriminate, we do not tolerate. That is not what I am talking about, and I do not know anyone who supports that.

But let me just say that we had 19 hijackers. Of those 19 hijackers, 19 of them were Arab. Of those 19, they were all within a certain age range. Of that, they were all male. All 19 were male. Of that, they were all active in this fundamentalist Islam faith. Not representative, by the way, of the general Islam faith, but active in a fundamentalist, corrupted, perverted view of that. So we can begin to put a profile together and we ought to be looking at people who fit in that category. If there are people that fit into that kind of category who attempt to cross the borders of the United States, we ought to pull them aside and ask them some questions. Obviously, we ought to detain them. Of course we should refuse them entrance into this country if they fit within certain risk factors. We would be crazy not to.

Let me reiterate that this kind of profiling is used in every stage of our life, even when we are born. What happens when a baby is born? They figure out how much the baby weighs, they figure out what the race is, they figure out if the parents are married. They send all this information in for statistical gathering. That is how we can determine, for example, in parts of the country, where we have a lot of unwed mothers. We profile unwed mothers. We go in and say, why do we have so many unwed mothers. Why do we have such a high level of teenage pregnancies. We profile it. We go out and figure out, okay, what can we do to alleviate teenage pregnancies like we have. We put it to a beneficial use.

My premise here this evening is that we can put to a beneficial use for the protection of the national security of this Nation profiling. So do not run away from it when a discussion is had on it. And my colleagues will hear about it back in their districts. I was asked the question, and when I started with my response, the reporter that was talking to me said, boy, you are taking on a hot potato. Do you really want to go into this kind of detail on profiling?

Do not run from it. We have to use it. My problem, again coming back, we cannot take this so-called theory of political correctness from the far left liberal side of the spectrum and let that determine whether or not we are going

to use that tool to protect this Nation's security. The question here is can we reasonably and in compliance with the Constitution of the United States profile and use it as a weapon of our choice and a weapon for our benefit? Absolutely. The answer is absolutely yes. And every law enforcement agency in this country ought to use profiling as a tool for their assistance.

Again, do not let people try to drag you into, well, you must mean race profiling, or you are out to go and get the Irish or the African Americans. That is not what we are talking about. That is a nice side show, that is a nice diversion, but that is not the focus here. The focus here is the security of the United States of America. The focus is what tool do we have that we can use, and that is why I feel so strongly about standing up when we participate in discussions on profiling to tell the other side of it. Tell why it is important.

Take a look in our society and have discussions about where we use profiling and the benefits of profiling, because there are a lot of benefits of profiling. We have huge benefits, particularly if we profile and one of these people shows up at our borders and they fall within that risk category, and we are able to stop an act of terrorism. We have plenty of evidence to do it.

By the way, most countries use profiling. Regardless of how wide you want to use it, a lot of countries are using racial profiling. They use whatever profiling they darn well feel like using. I am not saying we should stoop to that, but I am saying that it has proved to be an effective weapon.

They stopped the bombing of, I think it was a Swedish airline about 15 years ago. A lady walks up and she fits into the category because she bought her ticket with cash. Bing. One element of the profile. She had no check-in baggage. Bing. She is going here with no check-in baggage, and she was going transcontinental. So they asked her where she was going. She said my destination is here. They said, we know that, you bought the ticket. How long are you going to stay there? Oh, three weeks. She has one little tiny bag, no check-in bags. She falls within a certain age that they know they have had problems with. Bing, bing, bing, bing. This profile begins to set itself up. It alerts them, so they ask her some more questions, this and that. All it does is bring up more red flags. Then they search her. Guess what they find? When the suitcase is emptied and they weigh it, it weighs more than an empty suitcase should weigh. Sure enough, they find a false bottom and it is filled with high-level plastic explosives intended to blow that airline out of the sky.

We better profile. It is to our benefit and to the benefit of this Nation's security. It is to all our benefit, no matter what background we are, to go to war with every tool that we can use.

Now, let me move on very briefly and discuss our borders. I want to give some statistics that I think are pretty interesting. Our borders are crossed 500 million times a year. Five hundred million times a year through 300 checkpoints we have people coming across those borders. Now, the largest number of people coming across the borders are tourists. The largest number by far, 99.999 percent of the people that come into this country come in with good intentions. So how do we focus on that very, very small percentage? How do we get our sights on that very small percentage with the minimal impairment to the larger percentage while still accomplishing the security for the national interest?

It is a tough job. Just imagine trying to track 500 million crossings a year. I am not sure we have the technical capability. We certainly do not have the technical capability in place today to do it. Maybe we will have that technical capability within a few years, but not today. So the question comes up, should we continue to let the 500 million crossings occur every year or should we begin to clamp down on who comes across that border?

Now, I have a basic test, a litmus test, as to how to come across that border. My feeling is that I ought to treat it like somebody who wants to come into my house. When somebody knocks at the door of our house, rings the doorbell of our house, we look out the peephole. In other words, we do not allow them to come in right off the bat. We size them up, kind of profile them, look at them. We say, maybe we should ask this person a couple of questions. Then we may open the door but still not let them in the house yet. If I know them, I welcome them in. If I feel comfortable with them, I welcome them in. If they meet certain standards, I welcome them in. Obviously, if they fit the profile of a newspaper delivery person, and I know the person and they come by every time of the month about this period of time to collect a fee, I let them in the house and I give them a Coke or a Pepsi or something.

So what we ought to do here is look at our borders. I think for a temporary period of time we have to really clamp down on our borders until we begin to make significant strides in regards to this war. Right now that percentage of people that wants to do significant harm to the United States of America has grown rather dramatically. As we know, this United States of America is now under a national alert for an act of terrorism.

□ 2300

Mr. Speaker, I can tell Members that the likelihood of that act of terrorism, we can go ahead and put together what that group would look like. Number one, they probably are not native born

United States citizens. Number two, they probably have come across the borders in the last year or two. Number three, they probably had a background that if checked significantly, we would find that these are not the kind of people that we would want to let in our house or country.

I am not saying close the borders. That is not what I am saying here. Almost all of us are beneficiaries of the immigration policy of this Nation. I am saying in order for the immigration policy to work, we have to have rules of the game, and we have to enforce the rules. When we have somebody who violates the rules, we cannot let them continue playing the game if they are going to continue to violate the rules. You have to have enforcement of the rules and enforcement of immigration policy of this country.

Clearly if there has ever been a demand for enforcement of the policy currently in existence, it is right now. We have 3 or 4 million people a year come across our borders on visas, and they stay after their visas expire. Three or 4 million people a year stay in this country even when the rules of the game say you have stayed all you are allowed, now you have to go home. It is similar to a guest coming to your home for an hour for lunch, and pretty soon they are intending to spend the night.

The INS is doing a good job, but the reality is that the INS has two things they have been trying to do. One is to keep foreigners from turning into illegal U.S. residents. Two, to investigate domestic crimes involving foreigners. As quoted here, keeping track of foreigners' whereabouts in this country was not considered anyone's job. We have allowed these lax policies for much, much too long. It makes a lot of practical sense that one of the tools and one of the weapons that we can use in this war that we are engaged in is to tighten our borders.

That means the utilization of profiling. That means if somebody has a student visa, that we require that university confirm that person's presence, we set up a tracking system. That means that we start saying no to people. It means that we start getting numbers of people that we allow across our borders so we can manage. There was an ad, I do not know if it is still running on television or not, but some people set up a business on the Internet. They are waiting for their first order. They are worried. They have put in all of this investment, and all of a sudden order number one comes in. That is not much, but at least we got one order on the first day of business. All of a sudden 2, 3, 4. All of a sudden a hundred orders come across. They are smiling and happy. All of a sudden it does not stop and it goes to 1,000 orders to 10,000 orders to 100,000 orders. They are in panic. We cannot possibly manage 100,000 orders. We cannot manage it.

Mr. Speaker, the same thing is happening on our borders. Most people in the world dream of coming to the United States of America. A lot want to live here. It is the only country in the world where we do not have a problem keeping people. We cannot open the borders in such a way that the numbers are so huge we cannot manage them.

Today that is exactly where we are. We have so many people coming across the borders that we cannot manage it. We need to reduce those numbers so that it is at least manageable. So that we know that people that come across our border, those 3 million people that currently every year come across the border and do not go home when they are supposed to, that we can begin to develop management tools to fill that gap. That is one of the weapons we can use in our war against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is not politically correct to talk about we had better cut down on our immigration. I know it is not politically correct to talk about tightening our borders, but we got a real dose of reality on September 11. We woke up in the morning leading a normal life, and those of us fortunate enough to be alive at the end of the day got a real wake-up call.

We have to change our management practices, and one of the management practices we have to change are our borders which have become unmanageable. There are other things we have to change. You notice people agree across the board that we have to change the check-in procedure and security at our airports and nuclear facilities. Members will notice that Secretary Mineta today ordered no flying of aircraft by nuclear plants, et cetera, et cetera. We are changing our management practices. We need to change our management practices in regards to these immigration policies.

Now the President, of course, has taken the lead on this. Yesterday the President talked about student visas. We have a big problem with student visas. We have a lot of people who never show up at the schools. Student visas have kind of become the popular tool of choice to get into America, and then not have to worry about being held accountable to anybody.

Frankly, we have some universities, institutions of higher education, that depend very heavily on student visas because of the tuition that they charge foreign visitors. Those golden days will have to come to an end, despite the lobbying up here on the hill to leave student visas alone. We ought to stop the abuses, limit the number of student visas that we grant until we can get a management grasp on it. That is what I am asking for. Get it in our control.

I think we should quit hesitating about what we do allowing students of countries that mean us harm. Do you think we ought to allow students of

Libya or some of these other countries, Iran, Iraq, to come into this Nation? Should we educate them and train them how to fly planes? There are a lot of foreign students taking airline pilot instruction courses in this country as I speak this hour. We should not be ashamed of saying no to some people, and we should not be so worried about being politically correct that when we see someone from a country that is listed as a terrorist country, we ought to have enough guts to say at the border, You are not coming over here for your education and taking the benefit of our society to later on down the road turn against our society.

The National Journal, October 27, 2001 reported on a bill over on the Senate side which will require the airlines to submit their international passenger lists to the INS in advance so names can be run through the agency's look-out system.

Well, today most airlines voluntarily submit those lists. Today most airlines, notice I say most, voluntarily give their list to the INS to see if there is anybody on that list that is on a suspect listing or on the look-out system.

□ 2310

Guess which airlines that fly into the United States refuse to turn their lists over to the INS? Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. My response to that is if the airline coming out of Saudi Arabia, if the airline coming out of Kuwait, if the airline coming out of Egypt, if the airline coming out of Pakistan does not want to give us the list of their passengers that are flying into the United States of America, landing in an airport in the United States of America, to be dispersed once they get off the airplane into the cities of the United States of America, we should not allow those airlines to land in the United States. We are not asking too much to go to these airlines and say, we want your list. We want to know who you are bringing into this country. Is that asking too much? I do not think so. Just another example of sloppy management.

I want to commend the President. Yesterday he made comments about the tightening we need to take on these borders. He talked about student visas. The President and the administration is on the right track and he deserves the support of the United States Congress.

Let me move on to some final points I want to make, and that is about the battle that we are engaged in. I notice in the last week, there has been a lot of publicity about, gosh, maybe we're stuck in Afghanistan, maybe we're not accomplishing militarily what we hoped to accomplish. You know what people are doing, we are comparing the first few days. We controlled all the airspace over Afghanistan within 3

days. It is always when you go to pick fruit, at least when I picked fruit, when somebody hired me especially to pick fruit, I always filled my basket. The easiest time to fill a basket was when I first got to the tree because that was the fruit that hung the lowest. That was easy pickings. So the first couple of bushels came real fast. But when I had to get to the third and fourth bushel, it took a lot more work. It was not because I was bogged down in the apple tree, it was because of the fact you had to exert a little more energy. You had to climb up into the limbs, you had to reach out, you had to hunt those apples. You did not have four or five apples hanging where you could just put them right in the basket. You had to get up in the tree, you had to reach, you had to move the limbs to find them. That is exactly what we are engaged in right now. Do not try and urge the President to stop this war, or to slow down this bombing for some holiday that these terrorists would use simply as a shield to rebuild, take a fresh breath and recoordinate their strategies. We have got to go after those guys and gals that have instigated such horrible damage to this Nation. Actually the worst thing we can do and the best thing that could happen to them is for American people to begin to lose faith in the military effort that our administration is carrying forward. These are not tough warriors when you are able to get them out of their caves person to person. We will destroy them. There is no question about it. If you got them out of their caves, you got them in an open field, we destroy them. There is not even a contest there. Some people think that these Taliban fighters are supermen. They are not supermen. They have emotions. They are susceptible. I would much rather have our weapons than have their weapons. The fact is we have to locate them. They have extensive cave networks. They hide in the mosques. They hide in the schools. They move their weapons so that if you try and get them or their weapons, you have got to kill some of their civilians. That is exactly the kind of strategy they are using.

There is one other strategy they are using against the United States. When it comes down to it, they do not think the United States of America has the resolve to go after them. They think all they have to do is take a couple of Americans, capture them, skin them alive, torture them, send their bodies back in body bags and that the American people will lose their resolve to win this war against terrorism. If that happened, it would be the greatest military victory probably in history for an organization like the Taliban. It would be a huge defeat for the United States of America, because you are not eliminating the cancer. The Taliban is a cancer. If you do not get rid of that

cancer, it will come back and it will come back in a harsher form than you ever believed it could return in. We have got to destroy the Taliban.

Last Friday, I think, in the Wall Street Journal, Senator McCain, our colleague, wrote an excellent article about victory, victory in a war. This is a war. I would suggest to my colleagues, read this article. It is excellent. It talks about that war is dirty, that the consequences of war are horrible, but Winston Churchill once said, the only thing worse than war is losing it, and that is exactly what we face tonight. The only thing worse for us than this war that we are currently engaged in is to lose it. Do not try and urge our Armed Forces to lay down their arms until the job is finished. Support the administration until the job is finished. The President stood right here on this floor, right here at this podium, and he told us and he told the American people, this battle will be a long battle. This battle will be an intense battle. But that we have hereby resolved that we will eliminate terrorism, that we will fight this war. And so 4 weeks into it, I see some commentators saying, gosh, are you spinning your wheels? Are you stuck? How come we haven't wiped out the Taliban? How come you haven't found that miserable little guy in this cave somewhere? Give me a break. These are the very commentators that ought to drop that type of comment and ought to be saying, what can we do to help? This is our country, too.

I heard a commentator the other day that said, we have responsibilities in the media, to remember that yes, we are Americans, but we should not let that take away from the point that we should be a neutral party and that our obligation is to report the news. It sounded as though if you are a journalist, that you have a higher calling than being an American, you have a higher calling and that is of a journalist. And if it means that you leave the auspices of sanctity of your country to complete your job, that is the necessity of being a journalist. I could not disagree with that respected journalist more.

I do not care whether you are a journalist or a Congressman or whether you wash windows or drive taxis, America comes first. Your country comes first. Your obligation is not to your profession, your obligation is to your Nation. You need to stand for your Nation. We need to support our administration, and obviously our military troops, to carry out this mission until we win. Not until the Ramadan holiday starts. That was not a part of war. We need to carry this mission out until we destroy the enemy, until we cut their heads off, until we are so savage to these people, so horrible to the enemy that the enemy will never again have a future under which they would

consider attacking the United States of America. The price that they will pay has to be so high that they never ever again want to be in that war. That is what we have got to do. We have a mission. Every citizen in America has this mission, and, that is, your country comes first. The values and the principles of America have never been matched in the history of this world. Never has there been a country as great as our country. Never has a country done as much for the poor people of the world as the United States of America. Never has a country gone to more aid and assistance and gone to war across vast oceans to help friends. Never has a country contributed more to health care, to education, to industrialization than the United States of America. The United States of America does not deserve what occurred, what has happened. But the United States of America must accept the fact that it has happened and that the United States of America must respond with a horrible, horrible sword, because anything short of it will make you think of what Winston Churchill said, and, that is, the only thing worse than war is to lose it. For our generation and for all future generations, we cannot afford to lose this war.

□ 2320

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. CALLAHAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 107-258)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2311) "making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, for energy and water development, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of